

**REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS**

The following remarks and arguments are respectfully given:

The applicant has thoroughly reviewed the objections and remarks from the Examiner.

It has not been the intention of the applicant to broaden claim 11 with no limit. The perception by the applicant has been that the previously presented claim was restricted to describe an invention applicable to systems where prior art amplification and coupling techniques cannot be used.

However, the applicant can understand the objections by the Examiner. Therefore, claim 11 is thought to have been fully amended according to the objections and recommendations by the Examiner.

It is the applicants understanding that the objections by the Examiner for the dependent claims then largely are met by the amended claim 11 presented herewith. To further place the amended claims for allowance, claims 12-16 and claims 18-19 have been amended in order to distinctly depend on claim 1.

The applicant would wish to argue that claim 11, although the invention is applicable to other than power grids, now has been narrowed to explicitly define a single application, and that therefore the dependent claims are narrowed correspondingly, suggesting that dependent claims should be allowed.

Furthermore, the applicant has included the subject matter of claims 17 and 20 in claim 1 as recommended by the Examiner. The subject of double patenting is therefore thought to have been overcome.

It is also important for the applicant to point out that through an extensive knowledge of the prior art within power grid communication in utility and MDU's, good faith has prevailed when presenting the previous claims due to the fact that the applicant has not come across prior art that attempts to do the same as the previous claims sought to describe.

In that respect, the applicant highly appreciates the Examiner's efforts to detail objections and conflicts and believes to have overcome them.

Having stated that each remark and objection in the Office Action including objections were thoroughly observed throughout the amendments of the claims, this amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised.

Reply to office action of NOV 15 2010

DOCKET NO. N/A

The applicant respectfully believes that the amendments presented herewith places the applications in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 25 October 2010

/G. Vavik/

Geir Monsen Vavik  
Applicant